

The affiliation between Presbyterian Hospital and Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons was formalized 50 years ago and in 1928 gave birth to the complex of buildings known as the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center. This institution has benefited the entire world through contributions to better health.

Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University and Augustus C. Long, president of the Presbyterian Hospital in the city of New York, announced that \$35 million of the campaign goal will be used for new construction, already underway, to include the \$13 million William Black Medical Research Building.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, retired, is general chairman of the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center Development Committee. General Clay, chairman of the board of the Continental Can Co. and vice president of Presbyterian Hospital's board of trustees has guided the fund close to the halfway mark. He has interrupted this stewardship to serve the President of the United States as his personal representative in Berlin with the rank of ambassador.

In discussing Columbia-Presbyterian's combination of patient care, medical education, and research during the last 30 years, General Clay said:

I believe that it is not an unrelated coincidence that these same past 30 years have seen more forward surge in medical science than in all the previous years of human history. This is by no means a claim that all such progress occurred in the center, but

simply that the impetus in research, teaching, and treatment which found expression in the center idea has had extremely wide and useful results.

More than 3 million patients of all races, creeds, and circumstances have been treated at the medical center since it was opened in 1928.

The high quality of medical education and research at the Medical Center has drawn a steady stream of visiting scholars from all points of the globe, many of whom are leaders in medicine in their own institutions both in this country and abroad.

A most important accomplishment of the center has been the training of thousands of doctors, nurses, and other members of the health professions. Approximately 4,000 medical students, 5,000 interns, and residents, and hundreds of research scientists have gone out from the medical center during the last three decades.

This country leads the world in both the qualitative and quantitative scope of its medical education. Yet, it suffers from a shortage of doctors that threatens to grow more serious in the face of a burgeoning population and increased commitments for world leadership in all fields.

This merely adds to the urgency of supporting the expansion of our great teaching institutions like the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center.

In this era of growing requests by Government and private philanthropic organizations for research projects into

various aspects of diseases the enormous demands for maintaining and extending research activities require more and better facilities—facilities unthought of when the Columbia-Presbyterian buildings were on the planning boards in the 1920's.

The trustees of Presbyterian Hospital and Columbia University deserve the grateful commendation of Americans everywhere for their determination to extend the contribution of Columbia-Presbyterian toward better health by a major expansion of facilities for patient care, research and medical education.

I cannot too strongly urge Americans to support our free institutions like Columbia-Presbyterian in their dedication to nurturing a better way of life for all men.

Presbyterian Hospital, like all voluntary hospitals, is critically dependent upon funds from philanthropic giving, fund-raising campaigns, bequests and endowments to enable it to serve the community.

Yet this institution stands ready to serve regardless of the patient's ability to pay. Medical care is provided in the wards and outpatient departments, without charge, by attending staff doctors. Community volunteers serve, without pay, in virtually all parts of the hospital.

A gift to the medical center's development program is an investment in the health of our Nation. Furthermore, it is a promise to the free world that we shall not shirk our responsibilities for the well-being of peoples everywhere.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 20: 27: *Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.*
Eternal and ever-blessed God, we acknowledge humbly and gratefully that by Thy kind and beneficent providence we have hitherto been sustained and strengthened.

Grant that now, as we go forward into the days of a new year and a new session of Congress, with all of its perplexing problems, we may be sensitive and devoutly obedient to the leading of Thy divine spirit.

May our President, our Speaker, and the Members of this legislative assembly embody and express that noble kind of statesmanship which strives to preserve and perpetuate those lofty ideals and principles which Thou hast ordained.

God forbid that we should ever misdirect our aspirations and dissipate our energies by allowing them to become centered upon personal gain rather than upon Thy glory and the welfare of humanity.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 402. Concurrent resolution that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 11, 1962, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 402 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided. The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President

taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber: the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDT].

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representa-

tives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have a great pleasure, the highest privilege, and the distinct honor, and to me, particularly on this occasion, always, but particularly on this occasion, of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 251)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Vice President, my old colleague from Massachusetts and your new Speaker, JOHN MCCORMACK [applause], Members of the 87th Congress, ladies and gentlemen, this week we begin anew our joint and separate efforts to build the American future. But, sadly, we build without a man who linked a long past with the present and looked strongly to the future. Mr. SAM RAYBURN is gone. Neither this House nor the Nation is the same without him.

Members of the Congress, the Constitution makes us not rivals for power but partners for progress. We are all trustees for the American people, custodians of the American heritage. It is my task to report the state of the Union—to improve it is the task of us all.

In the past year, I have traveled not only across our own land but to other lands—to the north and the south, and across the seas. And I have found—as I am sure you have, in your travels—that people everywhere, in spite of occasional disappointments, look to us—not to our wealth or power, but to the splendor of our ideals. For our Nation is commissioned by history to be either an observer of freedom's failure or the cause of its success. Our overriding obligation in the months ahead is to fulfill the world's hopes by fulfilling our own faith.

I. STRENGTHENING THE ECONOMY

That task must begin at home. For if we cannot fulfill our own ideals here, we cannot expect others to accept them. And when the youngest child alive today has grown to the cares of manhood, our position in the world will be determined first of all by what provisions we make today—for his education, his health, and his opportunities for a good home—and a good job—and a good life.

At home, we began the year in the valley of recession—we completed it on the high road of recovery and growth. [Applause.] With the help of new congressionally approved or administratively increased stimulants to our economy, the number of major surplus labor areas has declined from 101 to 60; non-agricultural employment has increased by more than a million jobs; and the

average factory workweek has risen to well over 40 hours. At year's end the economy which Mr. Khrushchev once called a stumbling horse was racing to new records in consumer spending, labor income, and industrial production. [Applause.]

We are gratified—but we are not satisfied. Too many unemployed are still looking for the blessings of prosperity. As those who leave our schools and farms demand new jobs, automation takes old jobs away. To expand our growth and job opportunities, I urge on the Congress three measures:

(1) First, the Manpower Training and Development Act, to stop the waste of able-bodied men and women who want to work, but whose only skill has been replaced by a machine, or moved with a mill, or shut down with a mine;

(2) Second, the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, to help train and place not only the 1 million young Americans who are both out of school and out of work, but the 26 million young Americans entering the labor market in this decade; and

(3) Third, the 8-percent tax credit for investment in machinery and equipment, which, combined with planned revisions of depreciation allowances, will spur our modernization, our growth, and our ability to compete abroad.

Moreover—pleasant as it may be to bask in the warmth of recovery—let us not forget that we have suffered three recessions in the last 7 years. The time to repair the roof is when the sun is shining—by filling three basic gaps in our antirecession protection. We need:

(1) First, Presidential standby authority, subject to congressional veto, to adjust personal income tax rates downward within a specified range and time, to slow down an economic decline before it has dragged us all down.

(2) Second, Presidential standby authority, upon a given rise in the rate of unemployment, to accelerate Federal and federally aided capital improvement programs; and

(3) Third, a permanent strengthening of our unemployment compensation system—to maintain for our fellow citizens searching for a job and cannot find it, their purchasing power and their living standards without constant resort—as we have seen in recent years by Congress and the administrations—to temporary supplements.

If we enact this six-part program, we can show the whole world that a free economy need not be an unstable economy—that a free system need not leave men unemployed—and that a free society is not only the most productive but the most stable form of organization yet fashioned by man. [Applause.]

II. FIGHTING INFLATION

But recession is only one enemy of a free economy—inflation is another. Last year, 1961, despite rising production and demand, consumer prices held almost steady—and wholesale prices declined. This is the best record of overall price stability of any comparable period of recovery since the end of World War II.

Inflation too often follows in the shadow of growth—while price stability is

made easy by stagnation or controls. But we mean to maintain both stability and growth in a climate of freedom.

Our first line of defense against inflation is the good sense and public spirit of business and labor—keeping their total increases in wages and profits in step with productivity. There is no single statistical test to guide each company and each union. But I strongly urge them—for their country's interest, and for their own—to apply the test of the public interest to these transactions.

Within this same framework of growth and wage-price stability:

This administration has helped keep our economy competitive by widening the access of small business to credit and Government contracts, and by stepping up the drive against monopoly, price fixing, and racketeering.

We will submit a Federal pay reform bill aimed at giving our classified, postal, and other employees new pay scales more comparable to those of private industry.

We are holding the fiscal 1962 budget deficit far below the level incurred after the last recession in 1958; and, finally, I am submitting for fiscal 1963 a balanced Federal budget. [Applause.]

This is a joint responsibility, requiring congressional cooperation on appropriations, and on three sources of income in particular:

(1) First, an increase in postal rates, to end the postal deficit;

(2) Second, passage of the tax reforms previously urged, to remove unwarranted tax preferences, and to apply to dividends and to interest the same withholding requirements we have long applied to wages; and

(3) Third, extension of the present excise and corporation tax rates, except for those changes—which will be recommended in a message—affecting transportation.

III. GETTING AMERICA MOVING

But a stronger Nation and economy require more than a balanced budget. They require progress in those programs that spur our growth and fortify our strength.

CITIES

A strong America depends on its cities—America's glory, and sometimes America's shame. To substitute sunlight for congestion and progress for decay, we have stepped up existing urban renewal and housing programs, and launched new ones—redoubled the attack on water pollution—speeded aid to airports, hospitals, highways, and our declining mass transit systems—and secured new weapons to combat organized crime, racketeering, and youth delinquency, assisted by the coordinated and hard-hitting efforts of our investigative services: The FBI, Internal Revenue, the Bureau of Narcotics, and many others. We shall need further anti-crime, mass transit, and transportation legislation—and new tools to fight air pollution. And with all this effort underway, both equity and commonsense require that our Nation's urban areas—containing three-fourths of our population—sit as equals at the Cabinet table. I urge a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. [Applause.]

AGRICULTURE AND RESOURCES

A strong America also depends on its farms and natural resources. American farmers took heart in 1961—from a billion-dollar rise in farm income—and from a hopeful start on reducing the farm surpluses. But we are still operating under a patchwork accumulation of old laws, which cost us \$1 billion a year in CCC carrying charges alone, yet fail to halt rural poverty or boost farm earnings.

Our task is to master and turn to fully fruitful ends the magnificent productivity of our farms and farmers. The revolution on our own countryside stands in the sharpest contrast to the repeated farm failures of the Communist nations, and is a source of pride to us all. Since 1950 our agricultural output per man-hour has actually doubled. Without new, realistic measures, it will someday swamp our farmers and our taxpayers in a national scandal or a farm depression.

I will, therefore, submit to the Congress a new comprehensive farm program—tailored to fit the use of our land and the supplies of each crop to the long-range needs of the sixties—and designed to prevent chaos in the sixties with a program of commonsense.

We also need for the sixties—if we are to bequeath our full national estate to our heirs—a new long-range conservation and recreation program—expansion of our superb national parks and forests—preservation of our authentic wilderness areas—new starts on water and power projects as our population steadily increases—and expanded REA generation and transmission loans.

CIVIL RIGHTS

But America stands for progress in human rights as well as economic affairs, and a strong America requires the assurance of full and equal rights to all its citizens, of any race or of any color. This administration has shown as never before how much could be done through the full use of Executive powers—through the enforcement of laws already passed by the Congress—through persuasion, negotiation, and litigation, to secure the constitutional rights of all: the right to vote, the right to travel without hindrance across State lines, and the right to free public education.

I issued last March a comprehensive order to guarantee the right to equal employment opportunity in all Federal agencies and contractors. The Vice President's committee thus created has done much, including the voluntary plans for progress which, in all sections of the country, are achieving a quiet but striking success in opening up to all races new professional, supervisory, and other job opportunities. [Applause.]

But there is much more to be done—by the Executive, by the courts, and by the Congress. Among the bills now pending before you, on which the executive departments will comment in detail, are appropriate methods of strengthening these basic rights which have our full support. The right to vote, for example, should no longer be denied through such arbitrary devices on a local level, sometimes abused, such as literacy tests and poll taxes. As we approach the 100th

anniversary next January, of the Emancipation Proclamation, let the acts of every branch of the Government—and every citizen—portray that "righteousness does exalt a nation."

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Finally, a strong America cannot neglect the aspirations of its citizens—the welfare of the needy, the health care of the elderly, the education of the young. For we are not developing the Nation's wealth for its own sake. Wealth is the means—and people are the ends. All our material riches will avail us little if we do not use them to expand the opportunities of our people.

Last year, we improved the diet of needy people—provided more hot lunches and fresh milk to schoolchildren—built more college dormitories—and, for the elderly, expanded private housing, nursing homes, health services, and social security. But we have just begun.

To help those least fortunate of all, I am recommending a new public welfare program, stressing services instead of support, rehabilitation instead of relief, and training for useful work instead of prolonged dependency.

To relieve the critical shortage of doctors and dentists—and this is a matter which concerns us all—and expand research, I urge action to aid medical and dental colleges and scholarships and to establish new National Institutes of Health.

To take advantage of modern vaccination achievements, I am proposing a mass immunization program, aimed at the virtual elimination of such ancient enemies of our children as polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. [Applause.]

To protect our consumers from the careless and the unscrupulous, I shall recommend improvements in the food and drug laws—strengthening inspection and standards, halting unsafe and worthless products, preventing misleading labels, and cracking down on the illicit sale of habit-forming drugs.

But in matters of health, no piece of unfinished business is more important or more urgent than the enactment under the social security system of health insurance for the aged. [Applause.]

For our older citizens have longer and more frequent illnesses, higher hospital and medical bills, and too little income to pay them. Private health insurance helps some—for its cost is high and its coverage limited. Public welfare cannot help those too proud to seek relief but hard pressed to pay their own bills. Nor can their children or grandchildren always sacrifice their own health budgets to meet this constant drain.

Social security has long helped to meet the hardships of retirement, death, and disability. I now urge that its coverage be extended without further delay to provide health insurance for the elderly. [Applause.]

EDUCATION

Equally important to our strength is the quality of our education. Eight million adult Americans are classified as functionally illiterate. This is a disturbing figure reflected in selective serv-

ice rejection rates, welfare rolls, and crime rates. And I shall recommend plans for a massive attack to end this adult illiteracy.

I shall also recommend bills to improve educational quality, to stimulate the arts, and, at the college level, to provide Federal loans for the construction of academic facilities and federally financed scholarships.

If this Nation is to grow in wisdom and strength, then every able high school graduate should have the opportunity to develop his talents. Yet nearly half lack either the funds or the facilities to attend college. Enrollments are going to double in our colleges in the short space of 10 years. The annual cost per student is skyrocketing to astronomical levels—now averaging \$1,650 a year, although almost half of our families earn less than \$5,000. They cannot afford such costs—but this Nation cannot afford to maintain its military power and neglect its brainpower. [Applause.]

But excellence in education must begin at the elementary level. I sent to the Congress last year a proposal for Federal aid to public school construction and teachers' salaries. I believe that bill, which passed the Senate and received House committee approval, offered the minimum amount required by our needs and—in terms of across-the-board aid—the maximum scope permitted by our Constitution. I, therefore, see no reason to weaken or withdraw that bill; and I urge its passage at this session.

"Civilization," said H. G. Wells, "is a race between education and catastrophe." It is up to you in this Congress to determine the winner of that race.

These are not unrelated measures addressed to specific gaps or grievances in our national life. They are the pattern of our intentions and the foundation of our hopes.

"I believe in democracy," said Woodrow Wilson, "because it releases the energy of every human being." The dynamic of democracy is the power and the purpose of the individual; and the policy of this administration is to give to the individual the opportunity to realize his own highest possibilities.

Our program is to open to all the opportunity for steady and productive employment, to remove from all the handicap of arbitrary or irrational exclusion, to offer to all the facilities for education, and health, and welfare, to make society the servant of the individual and the individual the source of progress, and thus to realize for all the full promise of American life. [Applause.]

IV. OUR GOALS ABROAD

All of these efforts at home give meaning to our efforts abroad. Since the close of the Second World War, a global civil war has divided and tormented mankind. But it is not our military might, or our higher standard of living, that has most distinguished us from our adversaries. It is our belief that the state is the servant of the citizen and not his master. [Applause.]

This basic clash of ideas and wills is but one of the forces reshaping our globe—swept as it is by the tides of hope

and fear, by crises in the headlines today that become mere footnotes tomorrow. Both the successes and the setbacks of the past year remain on our agenda of unfinished business. For every apparent blessing contains the seeds of danger—every area of trouble gives out a ray of hope—and the one unchangeable certainty is that nothing is certain or unchangeable.

Yet our basic goal remains the same: a peaceful world community of free and independent states—free to choose their own future and their own system, so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others. [Applause.]

Some may choose forms and ways that we would not choose for ourselves—but it is not for us that they are choosing. We can welcome diversity—the Communist cannot. For we offer a world of choice—they offer the world of coercion. And the way of the past shows clearly enough that freedom, not coercion, is the wave of the future. At times our goal has been obscured by crisis or endangered by conflict—but it draws sustenance from five basic sources of strength: The moral and physical strength of the United States; the united strength of the Atlantic Community; the regional strength of our hemispheric relations; the creative strength of our efforts in the new and developing nations; and the peacekeeping strength of the United Nations.

V. OUR MILITARY STRENGTH

Our moral and physical strength begins at home as already discussed. But it includes our military strength as well. So long as fanaticism and fear brood over the affairs of men, we must arm to deter others from aggression.

In the past 12 months our military posture has steadily improved. We increased the previous defense budget by 15 percent—not in the expectation of war but for the preservation of peace. We more than doubled our acquisition rate of Polaris submarines—we doubled the production capacity for Minuteman missiles—and increased by 50 percent the number of manned bombers standing ready on 15-minute alert. This year the combined force levels planned under our new defense budget—including nearly 300 additional Polaris and Minuteman missiles—have been precisely calculated to insure the continuing strength of our nuclear deterrent.

But our strength may be tested at many levels. We intend to have at all times the capacity to resist nonnuclear or limited attacks—as a complement to our nuclear capacity, not as a substitute. We have rejected any all-or-nothing posture which would leave no choice but inglorious retreat or unlimited retaliation. [Applause.]

Thus we have doubled the number of ready combat divisions in the Army's strategic reserve—increased our troops in Europe—built up the Marines—added a new sealift and airlift capacity—modernized our weapons and ammunition—expanded our antiguerrilla forces—and increased the active fleet by more than 70 vessels and our tactical air forces by nearly a dozen wings.

Because we needed to reach this higher long-term level of readiness more quickly, 155,000 members of the Reserve and National Guard were activated under the act of this Congress. Some disruptions and distress were inevitable. But the overwhelming majority bear their burdens—and their Nation's burdens—with admirable and traditional devotion. [Applause.]

In the coming year, our reserve programs will be revised—two Army divisions will, I hope, replace those Guard divisions on duty—and substantial other increases will boost our Air Force fighter units, the procurement of equipment, and our continental defense and warning efforts. The Nation's first serious civil defense shelter program is underway, identifying, marking, and stocking 50 million spaces; and I urge your approval of Federal incentives for the construction of public fallout shelters in schools and hospitals and similar centers.

VI. THE UNITED NATIONS

But arms alone are not enough to keep the peace—it must be kept by men. Our instrument and our hope is the United Nations—and I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world. For the troubles of a world organization merely reflect the troubles of the world itself. And if the organization is weakened, these troubles can only increase. We may not always agree with every detailed action taken by every officer of the United Nations, or with every voting majority. But as an institution, it should have in the future, as it has had in the past since its inception, no stronger or more faithful member than the United States of America. [Applause.]

In 1961, the peacekeeping strength of the United Nations was reinforced. And those who preferred or predicted its demise, envisioning a troika in the seat of Hammarskjöld—or Red China inside the Assembly—have seen instead a new vigor, under a new Secretary General and a fully independent Secretariat. In making plans for a new forum and principles on disarmament—for peacekeeping in outer space—for a decade of development effort—the U.N. fulfilled its charter's lofty aims. [Applause.]

Eighteen months ago the tangled, turbulent Congo presented the U.N. with its gravest challenge. The prospect was one of chaos—or certain big-power confrontation, with all its hazards and all of its risks, to us and to others. Today the hopes have improved for peaceful conciliation within a united Congo. This is the objective of our policy in this important area.

No policeman is universally popular—particularly when he uses his stick to restore law and order on his beat. Those members who are willing to contribute their votes and their views—but very little else—have created a serious deficit by refusing to pay their share of special U.N. assessments. Yet they do pay their annual assessments to retain their votes—and a new U.N. bond issue, financing special operations for the next 18 months, is to be repaid with interest from these regular assessments. This is

clearly in our interest. It will not only keep the U.N. solvent, but require all voting members to pay their fair share of its activities. Our share of special operations has long been much higher than our share of the annual assessment—and the bond issue will in effect reduce our disproportionate obligation, and for these reasons, I am urging Congress to approve our participation. [Applause.]

With the approval of this Congress, we have undertaken in the past year a great new effort in outer space. Our aim is not simply to be the first on the moon, any more than Charles Lindbergh's real aim was to be the first to Paris. His aim was to develop the techniques of our own country and other countries in the field of air and the atmosphere, and our objective in making this effort, which we hope will place one of our citizens on the moon, is to develop in a new frontier of science, commerce, and cooperation, the position of the United States and the free world. [Applause.]

This Nation belongs among the first to explore it, and among the first, if not the first, we shall be. [Applause.] We are offering our know-how and our cooperation to the U.N. Our satellites will soon be providing other nations with improved weather observations. And I shall soon send to the Congress a measure to govern the financing and operation of an international communications satellite system, in a manner consistent with the public interest and our foreign policy.

But peace in space will help us naught once peace on earth is gone. World order will be secured only when the whole world has laid down these weapons which seem to offer present security but threaten the future survival of the human race. That armistice day seems very far away. The vast resources of this planet are being devoted more and more to the means of destroying, instead of enriching, human life.

But the world was not meant to be a prison in which man awaits his execution. Nor has mankind survived the tests and trials of thousands of years to surrender everything—including its existence—now. This Nation has the will and the faith to make a supreme effort to break the logjam on disarmament and nuclear tests—and we will persist until we prevail, until the rule of law has replaced the ever dangerous use of force. [Applause.]

VII. LATIN AMERICA

I turn now to a prospect of great promise: our hemispheric relations. The Alliance for Progress is being rapidly transformed from proposal to program. Last month in Latin America I saw for myself the quickening of hope, the revival of confidence, and the new trust in our country—among workers and farmers as well as diplomats. We have pledged our help in speeding their economic, educational, and social progress. The Latin American Republics have in turn pledged a new and strenuous effort of self-help and self-reform.

To support this historic undertaking, I am proposing—under the authority contained in the bills of the last session of the Congress—a special long-term

Alliance for Progress fund of \$3 billion. Combined with our Food for Peace, Export-Import Bank, and other resources, this will provide more than \$1 billion a year in new support for the Alliance. In addition, we have increased twelvefold our Spanish and Portuguese-language broadcasting in Latin America, and improved hemispheric trade and defense. And while the blight of communism has been increasingly exposed and isolated in the Americas, liberty has scored a gain. The people of the Dominican Republic, with our firm encouragement and help, and those of our sister Republics of this hemisphere, are safely passing the treacherous course from dictatorship through disorder towards democracy. [Applause.]

VIII. THE NEW AND DEVELOPING NATIONS

Our efforts to help other new or developing nations, and to strengthen their stand for freedom, have also made progress. A newly unified Agency for International Development is reorienting our foreign assistance to emphasize long-term development loans instead of grants, more economic aid instead of military, individual plans to meet the individual needs of the nations, and new standards on what they must do to marshal their own resources.

A newly conceived Peace Corps is winning friends and helping people in 14 countries—supplying trained and dedicated young men and women, to give these new nations a hand in building a society, and a glimpse of the best that is in our country. If there be a problem here, it is that we cannot supply the spontaneous and mounting demand.

A newly expanded food for peace program is feeding the hungry of many lands with the abundance of our productive farms—providing lunches for children in school, wages for economic development, relief for the victims of flood and famine, and a better diet for millions whose daily bread is their chief concern.

These programs help people; and, by helping people, they help freedom. The views of their governments may sometimes be very different from ours—but events in Africa, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe teach us never to write off any nation as lost to the Communists. That is the lesson of our time. We support the independence of those newer or weaker states whose history, geography, economy, or lack of power impels them to remain outside “entangling alliances”—as we did for more than a century. For the independence of nations is a bar to the Communists’ “grand design”—it is the basis of our own. [Applause.]

In the past year, for example, we have urged a neutral and independent Laos—regained there a common policy with our major allies—and insisted that a cease fire precede negotiations. While a workable formula for supervising its independence is still to be achieved, both the spread of war—which might have involved this country also—and a Communist occupation have thus far been prevented.

A satisfactory settlement in Laos would also help to achieve and safeguard the peace in Vietnam—where the foe is increasing his tactics of terror—where our own efforts have been stepped up—and where the local government has initiated new programs and reforms to broaden the base of resistance. The systematic aggression now bleeding that country is not a “war of liberation”—for Vietnam is already free. It is a war of attempted subjugation—and it will be resisted.

IX. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

Finally, the united strength of the Atlantic Community has flourished in the last year under severe tests. NATO has increased both the number and the readiness of its air, ground, and naval units—both its nuclear and nonnuclear capabilities. Even greater efforts by all its members are still required. Nevertheless our unity of purpose and will has been, I believe, immeasurably strengthened.

The threat to the brave city of Berlin remains. In these last 6 months the allies have made it unmistakably clear that our presence in Berlin, our free access thereto, and the freedom of 2 million West Berliners would not be surrendered either to force or through appeasement—that to maintain those rights and obligations, we are prepared to talk, when appropriate, and to fight, if necessary. [Applause.] Every member of NATO stands with us in a common commitment to preserve this symbol of freeman’s will to remain free.

I cannot now predict the course of future negotiations over Berlin. I can only say that we are sparing no honorable effort to find a peaceful and mutually acceptable resolution of this problem. I believe such a resolution can be found, and with it an improvement in our relations with the Soviet Union, if only the leaders in the Kremlin will recognize the basic rights and interests involved, and the interest of all mankind in peace.

But the Atlantic Community is no longer concerned with purely military aims. As its common undertakings grow at an ever-increasing pace, we are, and increasingly will be, partners in aid, trade, defense, diplomacy, and monetary affairs.

The emergence of the new Europe is being matched by the emergence of new ties across the Atlantic. It is a matter of undramatic daily cooperation in hundreds of workaday tasks: of currencies kept in effective relation, of development loans meshed together, of standardized weapons, and concerted diplomatic positions. The Atlantic Community grows, not like a volcanic mountain, by one mighty explosion, but like a coral reef, from the accumulating activity of all.

Thus, we in the free world are moving steadily toward unity and cooperation, in the teeth of that old Bolshevik prophecy, and at the very time when extraordinary rumbles of discord can be heard across the Iron Curtain. It is not free societies which bear within them the seeds of inevitable disunity. [Applause.]

X. OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

On one special problem, of great concern to our friends, and to us, I am proud to give the Congress an encouraging report. Our efforts to safeguard the dollar are progressing. In the 11 months preceding last February 1, we suffered a net loss of nearly \$2 billion in gold. In the 11 months that followed, the loss was just over half a billion dollars. And our deficit in our basic transactions with the rest of the world—trade, defense, foreign aid, and capital, excluding volatile short-term flows—has been reduced from \$2 billion for 1960 to about one-third that amount for 1961. Speculative fever against the dollar is ending—and confidence in the dollar has been restored.

We did not—and could not—achieve these gains through import restrictions, troop withdrawals, exchange controls, dollar devaluation, or choking off domestic recovery. We acted not in panic but in perspective. But the problem is not yet solved. Persistently large deficits would endanger our economic growth and our military and defense commitments abroad. Our goal must be a reasonable equilibrium in our balance of payments. With the cooperation of the Congress, business, labor and our major allies, that goal can be reached. [Applause.]

We shall continue to attract foreign tourists and investments to our shores, to seek increased military purchases here by our allies, to maximize foreign aid procurement from American firms, to urge increased aid from other fortunate nations to the less fortunate, to seek tax laws which do not favor investment in other industrialized nations or tax havens, and to urge coordination of allied fiscal and monetary policies so as to discourage large and disturbing capital movements.

TRADE

Above all, if we are to pay for our commitments abroad, we must expand our exports. Our businessmen must be export conscious and export competitive. Our tax policies must spur modernization of our plants—our wage and price gains must be consistent with productivity to hold the line on prices—our export credit and promotion campaigns for American industries must continue to expand.

But the greatest challenge of all is posed by the growth of the European Common Market. Assuming the accession of the United Kingdom, there will arise across the Atlantic a trading partner behind a single external tariff similar to ours with an economy which nearly equals our own. Will we in this country adapt our thinking to these new prospects and patterns—or will we wait until events have passed us by?

This is the year to decide. The Reciprocal Trade Act is expiring. We need a new law—a wholly new approach—a bold new instrument of American trade policy. Our decision could well affect the unity of the West, the course of the cold war, and the economic growth of our Nation for a generation to come.

If we move decisively, our factories and farms can increase their sales to their richest, fastest growing market.

Our exports will increase. Our balance-of-payments position will improve. And we will have forged across the Atlantic a trading partnership with vast resources for freedom.

If, on the other hand, we hang back in deference to local economic pressures, we will find ourselves cut off from our major allies. Industries—and I believe this is most vital—industries will move their plants and jobs and capital inside the walls of the Common Market, and jobs, therefore, will be lost here in the United States, if they cannot otherwise compete for its consumers.

Our farm surpluses will pile up, and our balance of trade, as you all know, to Europe, Common Market, in farm products, is nearly 3 or 4 to 1 in our favor, amounting to one of the best earners of dollars in our balance-of-payments structure, and without entrance to this market, without the ability to enter it, our farm surpluses will pile up in the Middle West, tobacco in the South, and other commodities, which have gone through Western Europe for 15 years.

Our balance-of-payments position will worsen. Our consumers will lack a wider choice of goods at lower prices. And millions of American workers—whose jobs depend on the sale or the transportation or the distribution of exports or imports, or whose jobs will be endangered by the movement of our capital to Europe, or whose jobs can be maintained only in an expanding economy—these millions of workers in your home States and mine will see their real interests sacrificed.

Members of the Congress: The United States did not rise to greatness by waiting for others to lead. This Nation is the world's foremost manufacturer, farmer, banker, consumer, and exporter. The Common Market is moving ahead at an economic growth rate twice ours. The Communist economic offensive is underway. The opportunity is ours—the initiative is up to us—and I believe that 1962 is the time.

To seize that initiative, I shall shortly send to the Congress a new 5-year trade expansion action, far reaching in scope but designed with great care to make certain that its benefits to our people far outweigh any risks. The bill will permit the gradual elimination of tariffs here in the United States and in the Common Market on those items in which we together supply 80 percent of the world's trade—mostly items in which our own ability to compete is demonstrated by the fact that we sell abroad, in these items, substantially more than we import. This step will make it possible for our major industries to compete with their counterparts in Western Europe for access to European consumers.

On the other hand, the bill will permit a gradual reduction of duties up to 50 percent—permit bargaining by major categories—and provide for appropriate and tested forms of assistance to firms and employees adjusting to import competition. We are not neglecting the safeguards provided by peril points, an escape clause, or the national security amendment. Nor are we abandoning

our non-European friends or our traditional most-favored-nation principle. On the contrary, the bill will provide new encouragement for their sale of tropical agricultural products, so important to our friends in Latin America, who have long depended upon the European Common Market who now find themselves faced with new challenges which we must join with them in overcoming.

Concessions, in this bargaining, must of course be reciprocal, not unilateral. The Common Market will not fulfill its own high promise unless its outside tariff walls are low. The dangers of restriction or timidity in our own policy have counterparts for our friends in Europe. For together we face a common challenge: to enlarge the prosperity of free men everywhere—and to build in partnership a new trading community in which all free nations may gain from the productive energy of free competitive effort.

These various elements in our foreign policy lead, as I have said, to a single goal—the goal of a peaceful world of free and independent states. This is our guide for the present and our vision for the future—a free community of nations, independent but interdependent, uniting north and south, east and west, in one great family of man, outgrowing and transcending the hates and fears that rend our age.

We will not reach that goal today, or tomorrow. We may not reach it in our own lifetime. But the quest is the greatest adventure of our century. We sometimes chafe at the burden of our obligations, the complexity of our decisions, the agony of our choices. But there is no comfort or security for us in evasion, no solution in abdication, no relief in irresponsibility.

A year ago, in assuming the tasks of the Presidency, I said that few generations, in all history, had been granted the role of being the great defender of freedom in its hour of maximum danger. This is our good fortune; and I welcome it now as I did a year ago. [Applause.] For it is the fate of this generation—of you in the Congress and of me as President—to live with a struggle we did not start, in a world we did not make. But the pressures of life are not always distributed by choice. And while no nation has ever faced such a challenge, no nation has ever been so ready to seize the burden and glory of freedom. And in this high endeavor may God watch over the United States of America.

At 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m., the President accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their chamber.

REFERRAL OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to file a supplemental report on the bill H.R. 8890. I am making this request in order that the portion of the report which shows the changes in existing law will conform to the present "Ramsayer Rule"—rule XIII, clause 3—which has been amended by the House since the original report on this bill was filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, without making the matter a precedent, that all Members today may extend their remarks in the Record and include pertinent, extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not expected that today there may be extensions in the body of the Record? Permission has been granted for extensions in the

RECORD, but is permission granted to extend in the body of the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. Yes; by unanimous consent.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN BUFFALO, N.Y.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide for the acquisition of a parcel of real property located at 641 Delaware Avenue, in Buffalo, N.Y., by the U.S. Government. This is known as the Ansley Wilcox House which became famous in 1901 when, in the library of this home, Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States following the assassination of President William McKinley.

It is one of only four sites, outside of Washington, D.C., where the presidential oath has been administered. At the time Theodore Roosevelt was sworn in as President, the house was the residence of Ansley Wilcox, who was a civic leader of great prominence. It was built in the 1830's as the major's house of the old Poinsett Barracks, and is typical of post-colonial architecture.

The American Institute of Architects has recommended its preservation. National, State, and local organizations, supporting the movement for preservation of the Ansley Wilcox House, are: Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society, National Trust for Historic Preservation, American Institute of Architects, New York State Historical Association, American Association for State and Local History, Frederick M. Houghton Chapter of the New York State Archaeological Association, Buffalo Federation of Women's Clubs, Sons of the Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, Daughters of the American Revolution, Society of Colonial Wars, Mayflower Society, Daughters of American Colonists, Society of New England Women, Society of Colonial Dames.

It is estimated that the cost of acquiring this historical site would be approximately \$400,000. Renovation would cost approximately \$50,000. Adequate parking space is available on the grounds.

In view of the historical significance of the Ansley Wilcox House, I strongly urge the Congress to take speedy action on this proposal while it is still available for preservation as a national shrine.

WHEAT ACREAGE

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced bill H.R. 9501.

This legislation is urgently needed in areas such as I represent where considerable wheat acreage will be removed from production. In brief, the bill would permit farmers to plant barley on the land taken out of wheat production, and make barley interchangeable with other feed grains.

Barley is one of the few crops which can be planted on the idled acres, most of which under the farming practices used in western Kansas have been in summer fallow. Yet, under the law farmers cannot plant barley on the land unless they have a barley acreage allotment.

Unless this summer fallow land is covered, preferably by a growing crop, it will be threatened by serious wind erosion. This land could be severely damaged.

To solve the problem, I have proposed that farmers be permitted to plant barley, whether they have an allotment or not, provided they take the same number of acres out of grain sorghum or feed grain production. This will maintain total acres in feed grains at the level provided under the feed grain program. It will permit farmers to follow sound conservation practices without any interruption to any program.

This particular provision was included in the omnibus farm bill passed by the House last year. Unfortunately, it was not included in the Senate bill, nor was it included in the conference report. Corrective measures cannot be taken by administrative action. Legislation is the only possible way of correcting what could be a very bad situation.

I hope the bill will receive early attention by the House Agriculture Committee. I do not believe it will be controversial.

For the information of Members interested in this problem, I am including the text of the bill in my remarks at this point:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is further amended by adding the following at the end of paragraph (1): "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a producer shall be deemed to have participated in the feed grain program for corn, grain sorghum, and barley, if the sum of the acreages of corn, grain sorghum, and barley, excepting malting barley, on the farm in 1962 does not exceed 80 per centum of the average acreage devoted on the farm to these three crops, excepting malting barley, in the crop years 1959 and 1960."

THE MIGRANT FARM LABOR STORY—I AND II

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring once again to the attention of my colleagues in this House the plight of some 200,000 working Amer-

icans and their families who are now living in the kind of squalor and poverty that made men shudder more than 100 years ago.

I refer to the migrant farmworkers of this country, who have until only recently been generally ignored by the public, the press, and, I feel, the Congress of the United States.

Many thousands of these workers are living today in the conditions which I have described, able to find work on only about 130 days of each year, often earning only around 50 cents per hour and too often forced to take their undernourished children into the fields so that the family can survive.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to see action taken this year by this body on the five bills which were passed in the other body during the first session as a first step in assisting this neglected segment of our population. The bills were forcefully managed in the other body by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS. I have introduced the same five bills in the House—H.R. 8879, H.R. 8880, H.R. 8881, H.R. 8882 and H.R. 8883.

Four of these bills deal with the present shocking situation. The fifth would establish a 15-member National Advisory Council on Migrant Labor representing farmers, migratory workers, health and welfare groups, and State officials.

The four action and regulatory bills speak for themselves:

The first bill generally prohibits employing children under 18. There is now no limit on the age or hours of children working in agriculture outside of school hours. Even 6- and 7-year-old youngsters work in the fields from dawn to darkness.

The second bill provides educational opportunities for the 150,000 children who follow the crops and average 2 or 3 years behind in their schooling. The bill would set up a 5-year program of Federal assistance to States and localities, including grants for summer schools.

The third bill provides a system of registering the often unscrupulous 8,000 crew leaders who recruit, transport, feed and house workers and contract out their labor.

The fourth action bill authorizes grants to public and nonprofit private agencies to establish health clinics. Migrants and their families now are less healthy than the general population. For instance, the infant mortality rate is twice that of the rest of the population, and few children are immunized against disease.

It seems hardly believable that the richest nation on earth would permit such conditions to exist for so long. In the nuclear age, when we are on our way to the moon, it is even less understandable that Congress can even hesitate before passing the migrant labor bills.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to include pertinent matter in the RECORD I include the first and second in a series of articles which were published last fall on this subject by the New York World-Telegram & Sun. The first of these articles was written by Robert H. Prall. The

second, and all of the other nine articles in the series were written by World-Telegram Staff Reporter Dale Wright, who lived with the migrant farmworkers off and on for a period of about 6 months. I hope to receive permission to insert in the RECORD, from time to time, the remaining articles of this series, which I commend highly to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the New York World-Telegram & Sun, Oct. 9, 1961]

W.-T. & S. TO BARE EXPLOITATION OF MIGRANT FARM LABORERS—REPORTER LIVED AS A WORKER IN FILTHY CAMPS

(By Robert H. Prall)

Four migrant farmworkers died yesterday when flames swept the hazardous, overcrowded wooden building in which they lived, near the potato fields of Cutchogue, Long Island.

Assistant Suffolk County District Attorney Theodore Jaffe, shocked by the "deplorable conditions" he found at the labor camp, is making a full investigation.

"Six people were living in space not adequate for a single person," he declared. "As one police officer said, it's legalized slavery."

REPORTER LIVED ROLE

The World-Telegram knows all about the squalor, the filth, and the dangers of life in a migrant labor camp. On and off for the past 6 months one of its staff writers has been working along the seaboard as a migrant laborer.

Staff Writer Dale Wright, using an assumed name, took on the job of a migrant field hand and lived with the overworked, underpaid, exploited laborers who harvest America's crops.

Starting in Florida, he worked his way north through the Carolinas to New Jersey and eventually to Long Island's lush potato fields. He lived in sordid shacks similar to—and even worse than—the quarters where the four migrants died yesterday in Cutchogue.

CHEATED, OVERCHARGED

He saw how migrant workers are cheated on their hours and their pay, overcharged on the items they buy, shunted from farm to farm in rattle-trap buses and trucks. He got to know the "labor contractor" who rounds up the migrant crews with promises of "good pay" and then exploits them at every turn. He learned how hundreds of migrants, at the end of a trail of broken promises, wind up on relief rolls at public expense.

He found youngsters 6 and 7 years old laboring in the fields alongside their parents. He talked with the gnarled, crippled older workers living out a hopeless existence.

Dale Wright's series of articles on America's "forgotten man," the migrant farm laborer, will start tomorrow in the World-Telegram. It is a shocking revelation that could be written only by a man who lived the part.

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE—I SAW HUMAN SHAME AS A MIGRANT WORKER

(Four migrant farmworkers died Sunday as fire swept their squalid living quarters in a Suffolk County labor camp, described by investigating authorities as shocking deplorable. The tragedy substantiates an on-the-spot survey by this paper. As long ago as last April the World-Telegram assigned Staff Writer Dale Wright to work as a migrant laborer to determine if protective laws are safeguarding the interests of America's "forgotten men." His articles revealing the abuses heaped on the overworked, underpaid, exploited migrant farm worker begin today.)

(By Dale Wright)

Despite certain limited improvements—on paper—in the laws protecting the migrant farm worker, he continues to be America's forgotten man—forced to work long, tortured hours, at substandard wages, cheated and exploited at every turn and compelled to live in filth and squalor and danger.

I know this because for 6 months, on and off from April to October, I worked as a migrant laborer along the Atlantic Seaboard from Florida to New York. I saw it with my eyes, I felt it in my blistered hands, I smelled it with my nose, and I rebelled at it in my conscience.

I labored with, slept with, ate with, and more than once suffered with the members of this vast army of men and women and children—most of them Negroes like myself—who stop and lift and grub from nature's earth a great part of the Nation's feed crop.

THINGS REPORTER FOUND

These are some of the things I found:

Many migrant workers are forced to work as many as 14 hours a day at a backbreaking task, the rewards of which are, in most cases, a string of broken promises.

They are grossly underpaid and, many times, not paid at all by conniving labor contractors who have them at their mercy.

They are cheated and exploited all along the line by profiteers in the roles of growers, shippers, packers, labor contractors, crew bosses, landlords and merchants.

Thousands of them live in shabby, unkempt hovels and shacks, usually hidden behind a clump of trees out of public view, without sanitary or plumbing facilities.

And, despite laws enacted to protect them, their children, starting at age 6, are worked long hours under a searing sun for less than the prevailing—or promised—pay.

HAZARDOUS VEHICLES

Under conditions inferior to those afforded cattle and freight, migrant laborers are transported from one work area to another in dilapidated, hazardous vehicles.

And at the end of the line, when all the crops are worked out, hundreds of the migrant workers wind up on relief at public expense in the Northern seaboard States.

The man who sits next to me in this newspaper office, Allan Keller, has done much to improve the lot of the migrant laborer. Mainly through his efforts and the campaigns by this newspaper over a period of years, a New York State legislative committee was named to look into the migrant labor problem and recommend changes in the laws.

Belatedly, teeth were put into regulations to provide better treatment for the migrant. The State Department of Health was empowered to license labor camps and require that minimum sanitary and health standards be maintained. Other States took steps—also on paper, to help and protect the forgotten man of America.

HAVEN'T HELPED MUCH

The changes in the laws haven't helped much. The miserable migrants, virtually without hope for a brighter tomorrow, are still hidden behind those clumps of trees.

At this moment, the migrant labor problem is being investigated anew by a subcommittee of the House Labor and Education Committee with a view toward drafting new remedial legislation.

It's another step in the long investigation of the stoop laborer, who has been studied, surveyed, microscoped, and diagnosed over the years as perhaps the sickest segment of the Nation's economy.

But I saw little improvement in the condition of the patient. The working and housing conditions were bad enough but it was the way he's cheated that outraged me.

He's overcharged for his squalid shack, his food, his clothing, his bottle of wine

at the end of a hard week of work. And he's gouged on just about every other item he purchases.

MEAGER BREAKFAST

I found workers in central New Jersey who were charged 75 cents for a breakfast of one chicken wing, a spoonful of watery rice and a slice of bread. An extra slice cost them 10 cents more.

In the Long Island potato belt, where the four migrant workers perished in flames Sunday, I found a large crew of men and women being charged by a labor contractor with \$1 weekly dues to a union which didn't exist. They also were being charged another \$1.40 for social security, far out of proportion to the paltry pay they had received.

In many cases, I discovered, workers forced to pay for social security had no SS numbers at all, the payments obviously going wholly to profiteers operating at their labor camp.

In Hastings, Fla., the heart of the State's potato belt, I bunked for 2 days in a near-collapsed, insect-infested shanty for which I was compelled to pay \$1.50 a night. Next door in an even more dilapidated hovel lived a married couple whose 2-month-old baby had been born there. They paid \$10 a week.

WAILING INFANT

The infant wailed endlessly from dawn to darkness in its makeshift crib, a cardboard cabbage carton, as flies and potato bugs crawled in and out of its mouth and nostrils. A ragged burlap potato sack served as the baby's blanket.

But Florida has no corner on squalor. Near Hightstown, N.J., less than 20 miles from Trenton, the State capitol, I found seven men and women tomato pickers—none of them related—living in filth in a 10-foot square tarpaper shack for which they were charged \$10 a week for rent.

Everywhere I traveled I found the itinerant laborer getting a wretched deal. And being inarticulate and always on the move, he is least able among America's workingmen to have his cries heard.

WORLD WAR I PENSIONS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point the following editorial which appeared in the National Tribune on January 4, 1962:

WORLD WAR I PENSIONS

The 2d session of the 87th Congress convenes next Wednesday. Coming before the legislators will be a number of important but highly controversial issues. These include foreign aid, tariff revision, medical care for the aged, plugging tax loopholes, and the necessary endorsement of the Congress to build up our defense forces. Practically all of these except the last will face determined opposition from particular groups in the Congress.

It is our fervent hope that another most important piece of legislation will be reported for consideration by both the House and the Senate. We refer particularly to H.R. 3745, or some kindred bill which would grant some form of liberalized pension for the men who fought the First World War.

Many Members of Congress have been most frank in admitting that if this legislation can be reported to the House of Representatives it will be passed with few dissenting votes. It is also believed that there

are a sufficient number of Senators who feel that something should be done to aid the older veterans of World War I to insure passage in that body.

The measure which has been adopted as the official pension bill of the Veterans of World War I, Inc., is H.R. 3745, and there have been more than a score of similar bills introduced in the House of Representatives. This measure calls for a 30 percent increase in pension benefits which are applicable under part III of Veterans Regulations. Specifically, the rates at the present time are \$78.75 for a veteran at age 65 or who has been on the rolls for 10 or more years, and \$66.15 for those under age 65, and who are permanently and totally disabled and meet certain income limitations.

Under the provisions of the Pension Act of 1959 which became effective July 1, 1960, there are some changes in the above rates with a higher amount payable to the veteran whose income is in the very lowest bracket and to those who have a large number of dependents.

It will be recalled that hearings were held on H.R. 3745 and other World War I pension bills last summer. At that time over 50 Congressmen either appeared in person or submitted statements to the Veterans' Affairs Committee setting forth in no uncertain terms their support for the legislation under discussion.

Chairman OLIN TEAGUE of the Veterans' Affairs Committee has indicated that he will call his committee into session at some later date to take some action upon a non-service-connected pension measure. The chairman has stated that he would like to ascertain first the findings of committee investigators who have been canvassing a cross section of World War I veterans in order to ascertain just why they have not in large numbers elected to change over to the Pension Act of 1959 so that they could in some cases be entitled to greater benefits, ranging from 8 to 10 percent. It is known that Representative TEAGUE is concerned over the fact that comparatively few World War I veterans and their dependents have chosen to transfer to this latest piece of legislation affecting them.

All of the major veterans' organizations feel that there is a definite and distinct need to liberalize the Pension Act of 1959 and undoubtedly they will press for some remedial legislation early in the session.

The men who fought in World War I now average over 67 years of age. Thousands and thousands of them are dependent upon the most meager income. Unfortunately, a large majority of them have never had the opportunity to earn sufficient social security entitlement that would provide for them a most substantial form of income. These persons are in desperate need and if relief is to be given them in the form of pension legislation it must come quickly.

The present death rate of these veterans is over 130,000 per year and as time passes this rate will accelerate most rapidly.

It is our sincere wish and prayer that this session of Congress will take cognizance of the desperate position in which these men and their dependents now find themselves and take speedy action to provide them with some tangible pension benefits in recognition of their services to this Nation over 43 years ago.

LIMITED FEDERAL AID TO CHURCH-RELATED SCHOOLS IS CONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, a thorough study of court decisions, and of 41 programs approved by Congress, reveals that Federal aid limited to the secular or neutral aspects of education in church-related schools is clearly constitutional.

The U.S. Catholic bishops' legal advisers, in their 82-page brief have done much to clear the air of misconception regarding the right of church-related and private schools to share in Federal aid to education.

The study addressed itself to this specific question: "May the Federal Government, as part of a comprehensive program to promote educational excellence in the Nation, provide secular educational benefits to the public in private, nonprofit schools, church-related as well as nondenominational?" The answer, supported by U.S. Supreme Court decisions and by Federal legislation is: "Yes."

Church-related schools perform a public function by providing essential citizen education and that this public function is, by its nature, eligible for support.

So long as the Government contribution is directed toward those kinds of expenses which are substantially the same in public and nonpublic schools, Government will not be involved in the purposeful support of religion.

For the reassurance of those who want to be certain that such limited aid is constitutional, I recommend the reading of: "NCWC Legal Department Issues Study Of School Aid Precedents" which appeared in the December 16, 1961, issue of the Pilot, published under the auspices of the Catholic archdiocese of Boston. Under unanimous consent, I include this contribution to American understanding and cooperation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NCWC LEGAL DEPARTMENT ISSUES STUDY OF SCHOOL AID PRECEDENTS

WASHINGTON, December 14.—The U.S. Catholic bishops' legal advisers have concluded that Federal aid limited to the secular or neutral aspects of education in church-related schools would be clearly constitutional.

The Legal Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference says in an 82-page study that such aid has precedents in at least 41 programs approved by Congress.

It states that the U.S. Supreme Court has held in three decisions that government can aid the nonreligious aspects of a public service performed by a church-related institution.

The study says government support can be limited to the secular aspect by being directed toward neutral items of expense, those kinds of expenses "which are substantially the same in public and non-public schools."

Support, it declares, can be given in numerous ways, but the study specifically mentions matching grants or long-term loans to institutions, grants of tuition or scholarships to students, and tax benefits.

NOT A PETITION

Massive Federal aid to public education alone, it says would produce a "critical

weakening" of church-related education and result in a dangerous government monopoly in education.

William R. Considine, head of the NCWC Legal Department, announced the study at a press conference here (December 14).

He said the study is intended as a comprehensive constitutional statement and not as a petition for specific aid. "It is our hope that it will serve to clarify constitutional issues and to cause a more widespread recognition of the massive contribution of church-related and other private schools to the common welfare," he said.

The precise question taken up by the study is this:

May the Federal Government, as part of a comprehensive program to promote educational excellence in the nation, provide secular educational benefits to the public in private, nonprofit schools, church-related as well as nondenominational?

Answering in the affirmative, the study points to the public service contributions by church-related schools, to U.S. Supreme Court decisions, to Federal legislation and to the peril it sees in aiding public schools only.

It holds that church-related schools perform a public function by providing essential citizen education and that this public function is, by its nature, eligible for support.

PARENTAL RIGHTS

Asking how support for the secular aspect can be distinguished from support for the religious aspect of education in church-related schools, it says this can be done by an allocation of costs based on the principles of accounting, "as informed by the basic legal and educational principles applicable in this area."

To limit support, the study continues, it must be directed toward the neutral items of expense. "A corollary of this principle is that Government should not bear the complete cost of constructing and operating nonpublic schools," it says.

"So long as the Government contribution is directed toward the neutral expenditures, Government will not be involved in the purposeful support of religion," it adds.

The study also says that parent and child have a constitutional right, supported by U.S. Supreme Court decisions, to choose a church-related educational institution.

And, it states that Government has been denied power by the courts to impose upon the people a single educational system in which all must take part.

The study notes that 5.5 million students, around 13 percent of the national total, are in Catholic grade and high schools. It estimates that Catholic schools in 1960 saved taxpayers \$1,800 million in education costs.

Social, as well as economic, benefits come from Catholic schools, it continues. "Typically, the Catholic schools are a meeting place for children of different economic and ethnic backgrounds * * *. They have historically proven an invaluable training ground to prepare citizens for full participation in a pluralistic society."

COURT DECISIONS

Turning to a detailed review of constitutional issues, the study says that opponents of the aid to church-related education generally rely on the first amendment's phrase that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

But, the study says, history teaches that the so-called no-establishment clause was meant to keep Government from transgressing upon religious liberty and was not intended to prevent relationships—even certain cooperative relationships—between church and state.

There are three decisions of the Supreme Court, it reports, which bear directly upon

the inclusion of church-related institutions in governmental programs to carry out public welfare objectives.

"Not only do none of these decisions hold such aid-providing unconstitutional, they flatly affirm its constitutionality," says the study.

The first case, an 1899 one known as *Bradfield v. Roberts*, involved payment by the Congress to a Catholic hospital for treatment and cure of poor patients.

The Court held that the payment did not constitute an appropriation to a religious society in violation of the "no establishment" clause.

In the second case, the 1930 decision in *Cochran v. Board of Education*, the Court held that it was constitutional to use State funds to provide secular textbooks for all school students because this served a public purpose.

In the third, which is the famed case of *Everson v. Board of Education*, decided in 1947, the Court upheld a New Jersey statute which provided that, as part of a general transportation program for all students, reimbursement to parents might be made out of public funds for the transportation of their children to Catholic schools on buses regularly used in the public transportation system.

"The underlying principle of the case," says the study in reference to the *Everson* ruling, "is that government aid may be rendered to a citizen in furtherance of his obtaining basic citizen education, whether he obtains it in a public or a private, nonprofit school."

COURT COMMENT

Two other decisions are also cited. They are *McCullum v. Board of Education* and *Zorach v. Clauson*.

Both, says the study, concern released time religious education and not Federal aid, but they do contain Court comment on the controversial "no establishment" clause.

The 1947 *McCullum* decision, it notes, brought the phrase "wall of separation of church and state" into prominence, but the 1951 *Zorach* case made it clear that the phrase was not to be taken "in any absolute sense."

Two additional decisions "involving the all-important rights of free choice in selecting educational institutions" are cited. They are the 1923 ruling in *Meyer v. Nebraska* and the 1925 decision in *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*.

In the *Meyer* case, the Supreme Court reversed the conviction of a Lutheran parochial schoolteacher charged with violating a State law making it a crime to teach in any elementary school any language other than English.

The court said the law violated the rights of the teacher, the parent and the child. "The court thus struck at a doctrine which is everywhere identified with totalitarian regimes and which is unhappily on the ascendant in the United States: the view that all educational rights are the possession of the State," the NCWC Legal Department study says.

In the *Pierce* case, the court expanded its rejection of statism in education, the department comments, and overthrew an Oregon law requiring parents to send their children only to public schools. Catholics, Protestants and Jews had risen in opposition to the law.

The high court held that the law denied parental and child rights freely to choose education in nonpublic, including church-related, schools.

LEGISLATION

In regard to legislative precedent, the NCWC study says: "No stronger answer is to be found to the argument that no aid may be afforded education in church-related

schools than the fact that the Congress has in numerous ways over the years deliberately provided such aid."

It notes that 41 such programs of aid have been reported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. One program has resulted in 488 grants of land and buildings to religious-affiliated schools of 35 denominations, it reports.

The study then concentrates on possible loss to the Nation and to supporters of private schools by massive Federal aid programs limited to public schools.

Predicting the weakening of all church-related schools, and the closing of many, it adds that this would mean that parents would no longer as a practical matter possess their freedom to choose a school other than public.

"Moreover, a practical governmental monopoly on education would result," the study charges. "This would not only dangerously transform our free, pluralistic society, but would also pose the most serious problems respecting freedom of belief."

Freedom of belief is threatened, it says, because "values are inculcated in all schools, not only in those in whose curricula specific ethical or social concepts are advocated, but also in schools whose curricula distinctly omit such concepts."

The person whose conscience dictated choice of a church-related school would be coerced to participate in schooling whose orientation would be counter to his belief, the study says.

There are some questions the study expressly excluded from its scope. They are: the basic constitutionality of Federal aid to education; the constitutionality of Federal aid to education exclusively in public schools; and the constitutionality of Federal aid to religious instruction.

The study did not attempt to explore whether there exists a need for large-scale Federal aid to education.

Considine said that the analysis of the constitutional issues was prepared by William B. Ball, of Harrisburg, Pa., in cooperation with staff members of the NCWC Legal Department.

Ball is executive director and general counsel of the Pennsylvania Catholic Welfare Committee and a former professor of constitutional law at Villanova University, Philadelphia.

Other major contributors, Considine said, were George E. Reed, associate director of the NCWC Legal Department, and Father Charles M. Whelan, S.J., of the Georgetown University Law Center here.

Criticism and advice on the study, he added, came from numerous authorities, and professors of constitutional law, including Wilber G. Katz of the University of Chicago Law School; Paul G. Kauper, of the University of Michigan Law School; Dean Paul R. Dean and Chester J. Anteau of Georgetown University Law Center; and Arthur E. Sutherland and Mark DeWolfe Howe, of the Harvard Law School.

Although all of these authorities have on recent occasions taken the position that certain types of inclusion of church-related schools in Federal aid to education would be constitutional, none has specifically endorsed the position set forth in the study, Considine said.

Attached to the department's major study was an analysis of the memorandum submitted to Congress on March 28, 1961, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which discussed the first amendment and Federal aid to education.

The HEW study is accused of relying on sweeping generalizations in some of the majority and many of the dissenting opinions of the Supreme Court, instead of upon the exact rulings.

The Government memorandum held that across-the-board grants and loans to church-related elementary and secondary schools are unconstitutional, as are tuition payments for all pupils in these schools.

However, it held that loans for special purposes not closely related to religious instruction are probably constitutional and that inclusion of church-related colleges and universities in any Federal-aid program is constitutional.

The text of the legal department study is currently being distributed on a limited basis, Considine said. A more fully annotated edition will be published, together with the HEW memorandum, in the winter, 1961, edition of the Georgetown Law Journal.

RAY OF PEACE

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the Women's National Press Club held its annual reception and dinner at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on Wednesday evening, January 10, 1962, the night of the opening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

The dinner is held annually by the Women's National Press Club for Members of Congress on the first night of the session. This year Walter Lippmann, the famed commentator, made an excellent address on the "Frustration of Our Time."

As I have read two excellent newspaper articles concerning this address, I am making part of my remarks the address contained in the Washington Post's issue of Thursday, January 11, 1962. I am also making part of my remarks an article concerning the dinner in the Washington Star's issue of January 11, 1962.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1962] LIPPMANN ON THE FRUSTRATION OF OUR TIME—BETWEEN WAR THAT CAN'T BE FOUGHT AND PEACE THAT CAN'T BE ACHIEVED—OUR SPLENDID TASK: UNITING OF WEST IN A PROGRESSIVE ECONOMIC FORCE

(The following address was delivered last night by Walter Lippmann, distinguished author and columnist, before the Women's National Press Club)

It is an honor, which I greatly appreciate, to be asked to speak on this occasion. It is also a personal kindness. For Congress is about to convene, and that means that there will be many speeches in the months to come. Experience has taught me that it is always a good idea to be able to speak early in the program. By the time Congress has adjourned next summer, adjourned in order to go out and make more speeches in the constituencies, your bright and eager faces may not be so bright and eager at the prospect of hearing yet another speech. I am happy to catch you while you are still in such robust good health.

When I sat down to prepare this talk, I considered and rejected the idea of delivering a kind of preliminary message on the state of the Union. I remembered that this will soon be done with much more authority by the husband of a former newspaperwoman. So I decided to talk to you tonight

about the state of our minds, the state of our nerves, and perhaps even about the state of our souls.

I am moved to do this by a letter I received just before Christmas. It was from a friend of mine who was a great hero in the First World War. He has been an extraordinarily successful man since then, and his letter began in this cheerful fashion. "My dear Walter: Another year of frustration, confusion, and compromise is about over."

I know that my friend is not alone in feeling this way and that during the coming session of Congress there will be many who will say what he says and feel as he does. At different times I suppose all of us share his feelings. There is indeed much frustration, much confusion, and—because we live on earth and not in Heaven—there is, of course, much compromise.

FRUSTRATIONS NOTHING NEW

I could have written back to my friend, reminding him that in every year of which there is any historical record, there has been much frustration and confusion and compromise. Anyone who thinks he can get away from frustration, confusion, and compromise in politics and diplomacy should make arrangements to get himself reborn into a different world than this one. Or if that is beyond his powers, he should move to some country where there are no newspapers to read.

However, it is certainly true that in our own time we are experiencing a very special frustration and confusion. There is, I believe, a reason for this. Certainly, if we knew the cause, we might feel better, even if we cannot do quickly something drastic to end the difficulty.

The age we are living in is radically new in human experience. During the past 15 years or so there has occurred a profound revolution in human affairs, and we are the first generation that has lived under these revolutionary new conditions. There has taken place a radical development in the art of war, and this is causing a revolutionary change in the foreign relations of all nations of the world. The radical development is, of course, the production of nuclear weapons.

As a scientific phenomenon the nuclear age began with the explosion at Los Alamos in 1945. But in world relations the nuclear age really began about 10 years later. For during the 1940's the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But by the middle fifties and in the years following, the Soviet Union has created an armory of nuclear weapons and has built rockets which have made it, for all practical purposes of diplomacy, a nuclear power equal with the United States.

The essential fact about the appearance of two opposed great powers armed with nuclear weapons is that war, which is an ancient habit of mankind, has become mutually destructive. Nuclear war is a way of mutual suicide. The modern weapons are not merely much bigger and more dangerous than any which existed before. They have introduced into the art of warfare a wholly new kind of violence.

Always in the past, war and the threat of war, whether it was aggressive or defensive, were usable instruments. They were usable instruments in the sense that nations could go to war for their national purposes. They could threaten war for diplomatic reasons. Nations could transform themselves from petty states to great powers by means of war. They could enlarge their territory, acquire profitable colonies, change the religion of a vanquished population, all by means of war. War was the instrument with which the social, political and legal systems of large areas were changed. Thus, in the old days before the nuclear age began, war was a usable—however horrible and expensive—instrument

of national purpose. The reason for that was that the old wars could be won.

In the prenuclear age, right down through the Second World War, the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. We did that with Germany and with Japan. The damage they had suffered, although it was great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany and Japan and the Soviet Union.

But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean 100 million dead, after the devastation of the great urban centers of the Northern Hemisphere and the contamination of the earth, the water and the air, there would be no such recovery as we have seen after the two World Wars of this century.

The damage done would be mutual. There would be no victor. As far in the future as we can see, the ruin would be irreparable. The United States has the nuclear power to reduce Soviet society to a smoldering ruin, leaving the wretched survivors shocked and starving and diseased. In an interchange of nuclear weapons, it is estimated coolly by experts who have studied it, the Soviet Union would kill between 30 and 70 million Americans.

A war of that kind would not be followed by reconstruction, it would not be followed by a Marshall plan, and by all the constructive things that were done after World War II. A nuclear war would be followed by a savage struggle for existence, as the survivors crawled out of their shelters, and the American Republic would have to be replaced by a stringent military dictatorship, trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

To his great credit, President Eisenhower was quick to realize what nuclear war would be. After he and Prime Minister Churchill had studied some of the results of the nuclear tests, President Eisenhower made the historic declaration that there is no longer any alternative to peace.

AN IMPOSSIBLE INSTRUMENT

When President Eisenhower made that statement no one of us, I think, understood its full significance and consequences. We are now beginning to understand them, and here I venture to say is the root of the frustration and the confusion which torment us. For while nuclear weapons have made war, the old arbiter of human affairs, an impossible action for a rational statesman to contemplate, we do not have any other reliable way of dealing with issues that used to be resolved by war.

It is enormously difficult to make peace. It is intolerably dangerous and useless to make war about the fundamental issues.

That is where our contemporary frustration and confusion originate.

We are confronted with an extraordinarily tantalizing and nerve-racking dilemma.

For as long a time as we can see into the future, we shall be living between war and peace, between a war that cannot be fought and a peace that cannot be achieved. The great issues which divide the world cannot be decided by a war that could be won, and they cannot be settled by a treaty that can be negotiated. There, I repeat, is the root of the frustration which our people feel. Our world is divided as it has not been since the religious wars of the 17th century and a large part of the globe is in a great upheaval, the like of which has not been known since the end of the Middle Ages. But the power which used to deal with the divisions and conflicts of the past; namely, organized war, has become an impossible instrument to use.

President Eisenhower and President Kennedy are the only two American Presidents who ever lived in a world like this one. It is a great puzzle to know how to defend the Nation's rights, and how to promote its interests in the nuclear age. There are no

clear guidelines of action because there are no precedents for the situation in which we find ourselves. And as statesmen grope their way from one improvisation and accommodation to another, there are masses of people who are frightened, irritated, impatient, frustrated, and in search of quick and easy solutions.

The nuclear age is only a few years old. But we have already learned one or two things about how to conduct policy in this age. It was once said of a British admiral in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the British Fleet and with it the whole war in an afternoon. Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy are in a similar position today. In a few days or so Mr. Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the promise of a Communist economy. He can lose all the work of all his 5-year plans, his 7-year plans, and his 20-year plans. In that same time, Mr. Kennedy can lose the Constitution of the United States, the free enterprise system and the American way of life and along with them all the frontiers, old and new. I don't think I am exaggerating. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred in recorded history. We cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter, which has been going on since they met at Vienna last June, unless we remind ourselves again and again of what war has become in the nuclear age.

The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough of all this talking and negotiating and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea of what they are talking about. They do not know what has happened in the past 20 years. They belong to the past, and they have not been able to realize what the present is.

In this present, only a moral idiot with a suicidal mania would press the button for a nuclear war. Yet we have learned that while a nuclear war would be lunacy, it is nevertheless an ever-present possibility. Why? Because, however lunatic it might be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to the point of lunacy where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings. This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. The nerves of a nation can stand only so much provocation and humiliation, and beyond the tolerable limits, it will plunge into lunacy. This is as much a real fact as is the megaton bomb, and it is a fact which must be given great weight in the calculation of national policy. It is the central fact in the whole diplomatic problem of dealing with the cold war. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which reactions become uncontrollable. It is the business of the governments to find out where that line is, and to stay well back of it.

Those who do not understand the nature of war in the nuclear age, those who think that war today is what it was against Mexico or Spain or in the two World Wars regard the careful attempts of statesmen not to carry the provocation past the tolerable limit as weakness and softness and appeasement. It is not any of these things. It is not softness. It is sanity.

But it leaves us with a task: because we cannot make war, because we cannot achieve peace, we must find some other way of meeting the great issues which confront us. For life will go on, and if the answers of the past do not work, other answers must exist and must be found.

The answer lies, I believe, in the nature of the struggle between our Western society and the Communist society.

It is often said that the struggle which divides the world is for the minds and the souls of men. That is true. As long as there exists a balance of power and of terror, neither side can impose its doctrine and its

ideology upon the other. The struggle for the minds of men, moreover, is not, I believe, going to be decided by propaganda. We are not going to convert our adversaries, and they are not going to convert us.

The struggle, furthermore, is not going to be ended in any foreseeable time. At bottom it is a competition between two societies and it resembles more than any other thing in our historical experience the long centuries of conflict between Christendom and Islam. The modern competition between the two societies turns on their respective capacity to become powerful and rich, to become the leaders in science and technology, to see that their people are properly educated and able to operate such a society, to keep their people healthy, and to give them the happiness of knowing that they are able and free to work for their best hopes.

The historic rivalry of the two societies and of the two civilizations which they contain, is not going to be decided by what happens on the periphery and in the outposts. It is going to be decided by what goes on in the heart of each of the two societies. The heart of Western civilization lies on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, and our future depends on what goes on in the Atlantic Community. Will this community advance? Can the nations which compose it work together? Can it become a great and secure center of power and of wealth, of light and of leading? To work for these ends is to be engaged truly in the great conflict of our age, and to be doing the real work that we are challenged to do. I speak with some hope and confidence tonight. For I believe that in the months to come we shall engage ourselves in the long and complicated, but splendidly constructive, task of bringing together in one liberal and progressive economic community all the trading nations which do not belong to the Communist society.

MAGNETIC ATTRACTION

I dare to believe that this powerful Western economic community will be able to live safely and without fear in the same world as the Soviet Union, and that the rising power and influence of the Western society will exert a beneficent magnetic attraction upon Eastern Europe. This will happen if we approach it in the right way. Jean Monnet, who is the original founder of this movement, has put it the right way. "We cannot build our future," he has said, "if we are obsessed with fear of Russia. Let us build our own strength and health not against anyone, but for ourselves so that we will become so strong that no one will dare attack us, and so progressive and prosperous that we set a model for all other peoples, indeed for the Russians themselves."

At the same time the wealth and confidence of the new community will enable the Western society to assist and draw to it the societies of the southern hemisphere, where social and economic change is proceeding rapidly.

You will have seen that I do not agree with those who think that in order to defend ourselves and to survive we must put a stop to the progressive movement which has gone on throughout this century. This movement began in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Its purpose was to reform and advance our own social order, and at the same time to recognize that we must live in the world beyond our frontiers. We shall lose all our power to cope with our problems if we allow ourselves to become stagnant, neurotic, frightened and suspicious people. Let us not punish ourselves by denying ourselves the hope, by depriving ourselves of the oldest American dream, which is that we are making a better society on this earth than has ever been made before.

Is all this conservative? Is all this liberal? Is it all progressive? It is, I say, all of these. There is no irreconcilable contradiction among these noble words. Do not Repub-

licans believe in democracy, and do not Democrats believe in a republic? Such labels may describe political parties in England; they do not describe political attitudes in the United States.

Every truly civilized and enlightened American is conservative and liberal and progressive. A civilized American is conservative in that his deepest loyalty is to the Western heritage of ideas which originated on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. Because of that loyalty he is the indefatigable defender of our own constitutional doctrine, which is that all power, that all government, that all officials, that all parties and all majorities are under the law—and that none of them is sovereign and omnipotent.

The civilized American is a liberal because the writing and the administration of the laws should be done with enlightenment and compassion, with tolerance and charity, and with affection.

And the civilized man is progressive because the times change and the social order evolves and new things are invented and changes occur. This conservative who is a liberal is a progressive because he must work and live, he must govern and debate in the world as it is in his own time, and as it is going to become.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 11, 1962]

LIPPMANN NOTES RAY OF PEACE

(By Frances Lide)

Columnist Walter Lippmann warned last night that nuclear war is an ever-present possibility even though "only a moral idiot with a suicidal mania would press the button" to start such a war.

"However lunatic it might be to commit suicide," he declared, "a nation can be provoked and exasperated to the point of lunacy where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings."

"This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century," he told a capacity audience attending the Women's National Press Club's annual dinner honoring Members of Congress.

"It is a fact which must be given great weight in the calculation of national policy."

"There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which reactions become uncontrollable."

"It is the business of the governments to find out where that line is, and to stay well back of it."

The speaker noted that "those who think that war today is what it was against Mexico or Spain or in the two World Wars regard the careful attempts of statesmen not to carry the provocation past the tolerable limit as weakness and softness and appeasement."

SANITY, INSTEAD

"But it is not softness," he asserted—"it is sanity."

"The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough of all this talking and negotiating and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea of what they are talking about," he said. "They belong to the past and they have not been able to realize what the present is."

Mr. Lippmann spoke before a VIP-studded gathering at the Mayflower Hotel which included Vice President JOHNSON, and a large contingent from the Cabinet and diplomatic circle as well as leaders of the Senate and House.

Noting that "the age we are living in is radically new in human experience," he declared that, to his great credit, President Eisenhower was quick to realize what nuclear war would be when he made the historic declaration that there is no longer any alternative to peace.

"The root of the frustration and confusion which torment us," he suggested is that "we

do not have any other reliable way of dealing with issues that used to be resolved by war."

"It is enormously difficult to make peace," he continued. "It is intolerably dangerous and useless to make war."

"For as long a time as we can see into the future, we shall be living between war and peace, between a war that cannot be fought and a peace that cannot be achieved."

"Our world is divided as it has not been since the religious wars of the 17th century and a large part of the globe is in a great upheaval, the like of which has not been known since the end of the Middle Ages."

TO AVERT WAR

"If nuclear war is to be averted in the struggle between the Western and Communist worlds," he declared, "the competition between the two societies will turn on their respective capacity to become powerful and rich, to become the leaders in science and technology, to see that their people are properly educated and able to operate such a society, to keep their people healthy, and to give them the happiness of knowing that they are able and free to work for their best hopes."

"For Western civilization," he continued, "the future will depend on whether the nations of the Atlantic Community are able to work together to become a great and secure center of power and of wealth—of light and of leading."

Declaring that he spoke with "some hope and confidence," he added: "I believe that in the months to come we shall engage ourselves in the long and complicated, but splendidly constructive, task of bringing together in one liberal and progressive economic community all the trading nations which do not belong to the Communist society."

Bonnie Angelo, president of the WNPC, presented guests at the head table, while the galaxy of VIP's in the audience were introduced by Helen Hill Miller and Nancy Hanschmann.

The newly elected House Speaker, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, attended the reception before the dinner and congressional leaders who took a bow from the head table included Representative CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma, new majority leader of the House; Representative HALE BOGGS of Louisiana, new Democratic whip, and Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, new chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee.

Newcomers to Congress who were honored included Senator MAURICE MURPHY, Republican of New Hampshire, and Representatives JOE WAGGONER of Louisiana, LUCIEN NEDZI of Michigan and HENRY GONZALEZ of Texas, all Democrats.

Mrs. Henry M. Jackson, bride of the Senator from Washington, also received a special introduction.

CAPITAL GAINS TAX

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to accord the benefits of capital gains tax treatment to authors in the event of transfers of all rights to the artistic works that such authors have created. My bill will include transfers of rights to copyrights and literary, musical, and artistic compositions.

I have introduced this bill in the hopes that it will become part of a series of the legislative steps that must be taken to stimulate the growth and development of the arts in the United States. In the first session I introduced additional bills to repeal the crippling 10 percent admissions tax on live dramatic and musical performances and to create a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. These bills, in my judgment, constitute must legislation if we are to take affirmative action to safeguard and strengthen the living theater and the dramatic and musical arts in general which are among our foremost national assets.

The underlying question in any arts legislation is to what extent should the Government be concerned with the cultural well being of its citizens?

The place of the dramatic and musical arts in the United States has been that of a poor relation. The theater, music, and opera are finding it necessary to struggle harder each day in order to survive the tentacles of economic adversity. There is little or no opportunity for growth and the best that can be hoped for under present conditions is to maintain the status quo.

Under present law tax treatment for authors of literary, musical, or artistic compositions is discriminatory. It is my conviction that an author should be accorded the benefits of capital gains tax treatment for his creations in the event he sells all his rights. This is a benefit given to the owner of a patent and if you examine the legislative history of the Internal Revenue Code you will discover no basis for favor of one group over the other. There are special provisions for the patent holder geared to induce and stimulate inventive activity. I believe that we should have comparable devices to stimulate literary, musical, and artistic compositions. Such legislation would serve an equally significant purpose with respect to the arts.

The strengthening of our cultural institutions will be of unquestionable assistance to all of us. What we need in the arts is expansion and experimentation. The poor relationship Government has had with the arts has merely compounded the downhill trend.

Enhancement of the arts must be cautious, yet vigorous. The environmental conditions surrounding the arts must be improved so that the arts can grow. My bill is another step toward that goal.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. LESINSKI for 2 hours on Tuesday, January 16, 1962.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1526. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Postal Savings System, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 261); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

1527. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to positions and their incumbents in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1528. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the 16th Annual Report of the Federal Aviation Agency operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 377, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. Supplemental report. H.R. 8890. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to extend their expired provisions for an additional year and to authorize payments under Public Law 815 for school construction in school districts with severe classroom shortages, to extend for 1 year the student loan program of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1063, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9615. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 9616. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 9617. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZELENSKI:

H.R. 9618. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 9619. A bill to establish and prescribe the functions of a Department of Consumers, and to require the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit, and to create a Committee on Consumers in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9620. A bill to deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Com-

munist political propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9621. A bill to provide (1) that the United States shall pay the actual cost of certain services contracted for Indians in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; and (2) for a more equitable apportionment between such States and the Federal Government of the cost of providing aid and assistance under the Social Security Act to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9622. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 9623. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish, construct, equip, operate, and maintain a fish hatchery in Clay County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 9624. A bill to provide that the lake formed and to be formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River, Ala., and Ga., shall be known and designated as Lake Roanoke; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 9625. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit wheat grown in connection with vocational education in agriculture programs to be marketed without payment of penalty; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 9626. A bill to revise the definition of "retirement-straight line property"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9627. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H.R. 9628. A bill to amend section 312(4) of title 38, United States Code, to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 7 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for a review of certain reports of the Chief of Engineers with a view to determining whether certain improvements of the Tangipahoa River are warranted; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. Res. 506. Resolution to designate, name, and identify the House Office Buildings as the Joseph Gurney Cannon, the James Knox Polk, and the Sam Rayburn Buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9629. A bill for the relief of Earl W. Self; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROVHILL:

H.R. 9630. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret E. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9631. A bill for the relief of Azizleh Abdallah Ayoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 9632. A bill for the relief of Richard Shao-lin Lee and his wife, Grace Fu-hwa

Tang Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9633. A bill for the relief of Augustyna Trzuskot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9634. A bill for the relief of Ursula Barbara Kolodziej; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9635. A bill for the relief of Faithy Isobel Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9636. A bill for the relief of Tom Hem (also known as Tom Him); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9637. A bill for the relief of Rito De Haro Saucedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, in this hallowed moment we humbly bow with the solemn realization that no changes in sessions or in debates and decisions can alter the fact of facts that until we find Thee and art found of Thee, we begin at no beginning and come to no ending.

As this day in a scene upon which the eyes of the world, some hopeful, some hostile, are riveted with intensity of interest, the chosen leader of the Republic pictures to the assembled representatives of the people the state of the Union, help the legislators and the millions who will listen on the speaking air to examine each his own dedication or lack of it—to the strength of that Union in these days of its greatest test and peril.

Give us to know that each of us individually is a part of America, and that to the extent that in all our relationships we practice our democratic faith, we are a vital factor in the state of the Union. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

QUENTIN N. BURDICK, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, attended the session of the Senate today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 10, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled; and that JOHN W. McCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker, and that the House was ready to proceed with business.

The message announced that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 402) that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 11, 1962, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, the Speaker had appointed as a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, Mr. ROOSEVELT, of California, to fill the vacancy thereon.

The message communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Styles Bridges, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Sam Rayburn, late Speaker of the House of Representatives, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. John J. Riley, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Louis C. Rabaut, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the committee appointed on yesterday to wait upon the President and to inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, has performed its duty. The President has advised us that he desires to deliver a message on the state of the Union today, Thursday, January 11, at 12:30 p.m., before a joint session of the two Houses.

JOINT SESSION TO RECEIVE COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 402) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two

Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 11, 1962, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the Members of the Senate will leave in a body at 12:10 for the Hall of the House of Representatives.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF U.S. CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of Public Law 719, approved September 7, 1960, the Chair appoints Mr. Edward Fenner, of Illinois, a member of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, vice Mr. William F. Knowland, of California, resigned.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 2 Leg.]

Aiken	Fong	Moss
Allott	Fulbright	Mundt
Anderson	Gore	Murphy
Bartlett	Gruening	Muskie
Beall	Hartke	Neuberger
Bennett	Hayden	Pastore
Bible	Hickenlooper	Pell
Boggs	Hickey	Prouty
Burdick	Hill	Proxmire
Bush	Holland	Randolph
Butler	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Saltonstall
Cannon	Javits	Scott
Capehart	Johnston	Smathers
Carlson	Jordan	Smith, Mass.
Carroll	Keating	Smith, Maine
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Sparkman
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Stennis
Church	Kuchel	Symington
Clark	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Cotton	Mansfield	Tower
Curtis	McCarthy	Wiley
Dirksen	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Dodd	McGee	Williams, Del.
Douglas	McNamara	Yarborough
Dworshak	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Miller	Young, Ohio
Engle	Monroney	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.